



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

Maeterlinck opens his 'Trésor des humbles' with a rhapsody on silence, prompted by that all-too vocal Preacher of Silence, Thomas Carlyle. But apart from Maeterlinck's esoteric doctrine, the significance and the power of silence are proverbial. Indeed, Goethe seems to think that we exaggerate its potency:

Es ist ein eigner, grillenhafter Zug,
Dass wir durch Schweigen das Geschehene
Für uns und Andere zu vernichten glauben.

Still 'todt schweigen' is a recognized process in German polemics; and I have long sympathized with the unfortunate French pamphleteer who wrote a reply to the silence of his adversary. Why all this obviousness? Simply because the course of my studies has led me of late to consider more particularly certain groups of syntactical silences in Greek; and I have been tempted to give some of my meditations on this subject the Farraresque title, 'The Silences and the Voices of Greek Syntax'. Every investigator, it is true, notes the emergence and disappearance of constructions, but emergence and disappearance do not mean birth and death; and the absence of a construction does not mean that it is not yet born. What is set down to non-development may be due to suppression. Hence the especial interest of the syntactical silences of Homer. How these silences are to be interpreted will depend largely on one's aesthetic code. How far back shall we push the reign of conscious art, how far the evolution of the epos? Thus a mere syntactical inquiry brings us face to face with the Homeric Question; so that in reading M. BRÉAL's brilliant brochure, *Un problème de l'histoire littéraire*, I have been reminded more than once of such problems as the absence of the historical present, of the articular infinitive, of the consecutive sentence, to cite only some of the most familiar instances.

Homeric theory is a rough shore, and one shudders when one thinks what might have happened, if one had followed the fashionable guides of fifty years ago and had insisted on landing:

ἐνθα κ' ἀπὸ ρίνουδ' δρούφθῃ σὺν τ' ὅστε' ἀράχθῃ,

whereas your floater can pass readily from the unitarian preaching of TERRET (A. J. P. XX 87) to the remorseless analysis

of ROBERT (A. J. P. XXII 467), or else allow himself to be rocked *κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις* by M. BRÉAL's attractive handling of the Homeric Question, in which the silences of Homer receive due attention. In the brief summary, the brief neutral summary I shall give here, the brilliance of M. BRÉAL's essay will be lost, but the practical lesson will abide. On M. BRÉAL's theory the young student will be able to enjoy his Homer without the importunate intrusion of many problems that are forced on the schoolboy before he can fairly enter on the most precious literary heritage of the ages. In short, M. BRÉAL's student will be as happy as some of us were in the first half of the last century when we read Homer, Vergil, Ariosto and Tasso without much concern for literary theories.

M. BRÉAL does not believe with Schlegel that the epos simply grew, nor with Jakob Grimm that it made itself. He refuses to be mystified by 'organic growth' and the word 'dynamic' has no charm for him, nor does he show any acquaintance with Professor Gummere's lucubrations. Even the excavations of Hissarlik, Mykenai, Tiryns leave M. BRÉAL cool, if not cold. Ever since Schliemann began to dig, the grave-digger's song in Hamlet has been the burden of the Homeric scholar. But 'a pickaxe and a spade, a spade', is followed by the call for a 'shrouding sheet', and that shrouding sheet has shrouded much besides the 'solar theory'. Nothing more tragic to me than the traces of Schliemann's eager demolition of the real Troy, the real Troy of to-day. Now, according to M. BRÉAL, the great lesson taught by these layers of pre-Homeric civilization is the nearness of Homer to our own times. What used to be very distant is but the past of yesterday.

The true Homer, continues M. BRÉAL, is to be sought not in the narrative, nor in the imaginative part of the poems, but in those portions in which the poet addresses himself to men and not to grown-up children, desirous of being diverted and amused; and he thinks it quite as extravagant to suppose that Homer's audience believed the fairy tales of the Homeric narrative as to suppose that the Italians of the fifteenth century accepted the adventures of Orlando as a chapter of their history. And so, in the teeth of Homeric scholars, he contends that we are not to discard the *Πρεσβεία πρὸς Ἀχιλλέα* and the *Ἑκτορος λύτρα* in favor of any Ur-Ilias. Not that M. BRÉAL believes that there has been no interpolation. Much has been added to the original stock, whole books, in fact, mere repetitions of old phrases, old situations. But the passages that forward the action, that bring about the necessary conclusion, that paint situations or reveal

characters—these are not additaments, and M. BRÉAL protests against the criticism that would rob us of the best things in Homer under the pretext of carrying us back to the primitive form.

The primitive effect, according to M. BRÉAL is due partly to the *mise en scène*, partly to modern theories; and the *mise en scène* has to do with the silences of Homer. Of the great antiquity of writing there can be no question. True, only a few years ago it might have been said that the incontestable existence of writing in Egypt and Assyria proves nothing for Greece. But Evans has made that position forever impossible. The mention of writing is suppressed, and suppressed in order to keep up the heroic atmosphere. The obscure mention of those ‘characters of hell’, the *σήματα λυγρά*, shows nothing but the embarrassment of the poet. Statues and paintings are found in the palace of Minos centuries and centuries before Homer. Why does Homer simply leave us to infer their existence? For they must have existed in his time. The Apollo of Chryses was doubtless a statue, and the knees of Athene, on which Andromache spread the precious *πέπλος* (Il. 6, 303), were the knees of a statue. Decorative art abounds. Why should there be no religious art? Why the elaborate adornment of the shields of Achilles and not a single statue of a deity? As there is no direct mention of sculpture, so there is no direct mention of painting. But *χρυσόθρονος Ἡρῆ* and *κυανοχαῖτα Ποσειδάων* and the nimbus about the head of Achilles are evidences that painting was known to Homer. So the Homeric poems affect to be ignorant of coins. It is pure affectation. Coins had been in use three thousand years before the Christian era and M. BRÉAL refuses to accept payment in kind. It is a mere tradition of the school; and so imperative is the tradition that in the youngest part of the Iliad, the twenty-third book, tripods and basins are employed as the medium of exchange and not money current with the merchant.

Fénelon’s ‘*aimable simplicité du monde commençant*’ is a pretty phrase, but it is nothing more. Odysseus builds his bridal couch with his own hands, and proceeds to adorn his backwoods bed with gold and silver and ivory and purple. He is as inconsistent as Vergil in his description of the humble cottage of good Evander, as Fénelon himself in his description of the grotto of Calypso. The equipment does not match the abode in either case. Nausikaa, the divine washerwoman, is the daughter of a king who is surrounded by a splendid court and holds games like those of Olympia and of Delphi. It is time for us to stop laughing at Mme. Dacier, who, in translating the

Iliad, saw everywhere nobles and princes. She was nearer the truth, she was more in touch with the spirit of Homeric society than those who make of the Greek and Trojan warriors contemporaries of an age of blood, the coarse types of a period of barbarism and murder.

The heroes of the Iliad were not only valorous as became warriors of such lofty lineage. They were eloquent. The eternal antithesis of word and deed is present in Homer. Cheiron *δικαιότατος Κενταύρων*, the master of Achilles, and the undying type of the teacher, taught both, taught what was afterwards known as *μουσική καὶ γυμναστική*. The life of the *ἀγορά* is fully established. The ceremonial is fixed. The herald puts the staff in the hands of the orator who has the floor. The styles of the various speakers, Menelaos, Odysseus, Nestor, are characterized by Homer himself. *ἀγορεύειν*, 'to harangue' becomes so common a word for speaking that Penelope 'harangues' her nurse in secret. There are schools and schoolmasters. As Achilles is the pupil of Cheiron, Telemachos is pupil of Mentor, Aineias of Alkathoos. The Iliad is full of types and models. It is a mirror of magistrates, of kings. < When Robert Stephens dedicated his Homer to Francis I, *ἀγαθῷ βασιλεῖ τ' ἀγαθῷ τ' αἰχμητῇ*, he justly recognized the typical character of Agamemnon >. We are not far from gnomic poetry in Homer.

But after all there is a decided antique coloring, and great part of this is due, as M. BRÉAL insists, to the style of fighting. The military art of Homer is very different from what we find in the literary remains of the seventh and sixth centuries, Archilochos, Alkaios, < not to say > Tyrtaios, < who is not in very good repute just now >. The cavalry arm is notoriously absent. We have only war chariots, and these war chariots are descended in more or less direct line from the monuments of Egypt and Assyria. Even the swift-footed Achilles mounts a chariot occasionally. Agamemnon, Menelaos, Idomeneus, become heroes after the Egyptian pattern. The consequence is that at a time when large and disciplined armies were operating in Asia, the Homeric battles resolved themselves into a series of single combats. < ROBERT recognized the fact that some of the Homeric armour was Brummagem stuff > (A. J. P. XXII 468). According to M. BRÉAL it is all Brummagem. The minute description of contemporary equipment belongs to a much later stage of art.

In the Homeric style there are two factors, the one the poet, the other tradition. To the poet we owe the greatness of the

framework, the truth of the characters, the harmony of the whole; to tradition the measure of the verse, the abundance of the vocabulary, the wealth of grammatical forms, the use of formulae for all the affairs of life, standing epithets and consecrated phrases. These things are the sediment of ages, and the hexameter alone is a proof of a long development. It is one of the strictest of verses, as Wilamowitz has remarked. It admits none of the licenses of folk-poetry, protraction, correption, syncope. The structure of the hexameter alone is fatal to any Lachmann ballad theory. The language itself has no counterpart in any spoken dialect. It is full of diverse elements, Ionian, Aeolian, Cypriote. However fashioned, it had long been a mixed language, a 'Kunstsprache'. The rhapsodes may have modified the original form to suit their audiences, but that does not solve the difficulty. So for two centuries, says M. BRÉAL, French troubadours composed their poems in a Limousin dialect, larded with Catalan, Provençal and Italian forms. The digamma, of which so much has been made since Bentley's time, fails as a test of the age of the different books, fails as a proof of antiquity. There are dialects in which the digamma was preserved long after the period assigned to Homer. And the text is uncertain. Witness Plato (A. J. P. XXIII 233), witness the Greek papyri. One scholar goes so far as to maintain that we cannot be certain that we have a single verse that runs as it did in the original text.

M. BRÉAL's next contention pertains to the difference between 'Volksepos' and 'Kunstepos', and here he emphasizes especially the jerkiness of the ballad and the sustained flow of the Homeric poems, the continuity of the narrative, the serenity of the thought. But in claiming this distinguishing excellence for Homer, M. BRÉAL does not undertake to say that Homer had no predecessors. Others had sung the stories of Meleager and Bellerophon. He does not undertake to say that there are no interpolations. The temptation of the rhapsodists to interweave local legends was too great. A Cretan audience was only too ready to welcome the adventures of Idomeneus. The style was copied and the soldering was more or less successful.—A Cretan audience—but what was the character of that audience? Are we to say, as has been said, that the *Odyssey* is the sailors' poem, the *Iliad* the soldiers'? No, if by these characteristics we are to explain the origin of the poems. The common people do not figure much in Homer. <D—n the public, said an American capitalist.> δλέκοντο δὲ λαοί is about as much notice as the herd gets in the Homeric poems. It is court poetry with which we have to deal <in the *Odyssey*>. The singers are court poets and queens preside over the performances. The audience is cultivated. It does not need a mythological dictionary. It is

liberal. It does not take its gods too seriously. It is frankly amused at the 'spats' of Zeus and Here, at the trap set to catch Ares and Aphrodite, at Athene's mocking comment on the misadventure of the Goddess of Love in her encounter with Diomed.

The tone is free, but it is never low or vulgar. The invectives exchanged by the two chiefs in the Iliad are words spoken not only in anger but by anger; and anger is always vulgar. Achilles recovers his poise. Agamemnon makes the *amende honorable*. Hektor and Aias are as courteous as any mediaeval knights. No wonder that Hektor became a type of chivalry in the middle ages. The warriors of Homer are as enamored of glory as if they were Frenchmen. 'Military honor' was not invented then; *αἰδώς* must serve for it in Homer <as *αἰσχύνη* serves for it in Thukydides>. As for the portraits of women, I am quite in accord with M. BRÉAL in his admiration of Homer's mastery. Helen is a real woman as well as a real goddess. Andromache I have personally known as a Confederate heroine, and the man that does not understand the moods of Penelope does not know the elements of a study that is even more interesting than the study of Homer.

But what was the audience? we ask again. It was made up, says M. BRÉAL, of the *ἀριστῆες*, of the old families, say of Smyrna and Miletus, of adventurers by land and sea, successful freebooters, rich merchants, ship-owners, active, intelligent men, curious, cultivated men who knew life and loved the arts. The poems were recited at the great festivals. <The epos season might roughly be compared with the opera season>. As has been said, M. BRÉAL thinks that this audience was not very exacting as to the historical basis. Nor, if M. BRÉAL is right, need we be. True, there must have been some historical basis, some expedition that set out for Europe against a powerful Asiatic Kingdom. About this adventure crystallized a number of legends, the fellows of which we find again in other peoples of the Indo-European race. There are some vague topographical traditions, and King Priam, with his wealth, his wives, his sons-in-law and daughters-in-law is a typical Grand Turk. As for the poet himself we know nothing. Absolute silence as to his country, as to his time. The Lydians are not mentioned. Carians are *βαρβαρόφωνοι*. Phrygians are mentioned because they are allies of the Trojans. The Phoenicians are sly merchants. Even the Greeks have no one name. It is as if it were dangerous to call names. As for Homer's time, M. BRÉAL rejects the statement of Herodotos. He will not allow two centuries, or even one, between Homer and Alkman. He has no sympathy with attempts to reconstruct the 'Ur-Ilias', to

lop off the branches and strip off the foliage of this Ygdrasil of poetry. True, on this theory the Iliad ceases to be incomprehensible in itself and unique in its class. Those who are inclined to mystery, he says, will perhaps regret a poetry that emerges from the popular soul like the lotus from a pond of India, but those who have clear ideas will not enjoy the Homeric poems less for having been composed in a period of culture and art, in the midst of a population fond of legend and poetry.—The Iliad is only the first and the most beautiful of epopees.

The first volume of KROMAYER'S *Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland* (Berlin, Weidmann) opens a series of monographs that will attract wide and respectful attention. It is the fruit of an expedition undertaken in the year 1900 by two military men, Col. JANKE and Capt. GÖPPEL, and by the scholar whose name the volume bears. The period embraced extends from Epaminondas to the intervention of the Romans and the battle-fields studied are Mantinea (362); Chaironeia (338); Sellasia (221) and Mantinea again (207). Of course, this is not the first attempt to study ancient battle-fields with the help of autopsy, but it is only too true that most of the work in this domain has been chimney-corner work. What were the history of a modern campaign without maps? And yet we are left by the ancient historians to fight the battles of the past without these visual resources. No wonder that Frederick the Great thought little of the value of Caesar's military memoirs. True, there are noteworthy exceptions to this mere book-work, and Herr KROMAYER pays a deserved tribute to Napoleon the Third, to Stoffel, to Grundy. In fact, the present activity in this topographical study is one of the causes of the limitations of the present undertaking. The earlier periods, the period of the Persian War and the period of the Peloponnesian War have already enlisted the energies of competent men and where so much is to be done, there is no sense in duplication.

The advantages of the study of Greek battle-fields are great, and Herr KROMAYER does not fail to emphasize them. One great trouble that we have to encounter elsewhere is the difficulty of ascertaining where such and such a battle was fought. The historian has a serious bit of work to do before the cartographer can set up his drawing-board. Think of the dispute over the battle with Ariovistus, over the defeat of Varus. In Greece we are better off. Greece is a land of ancient culture, thick-sown with towns. The name of the place fixes the battle-field within a few square kilometers. Then there are few plains. The mountains are so steep and rocky that they may be left out of the

account; and the zone of hills is narrow. Moreover, in the dry and thirsty land of Greece, water becomes an important element and helps to determine the battle-field, and if we ask, whether the millennia that have intervened may not have changed the face of the earth beyond recognition, we have the assurance of Moltke that all the changes of civilization, of desolation, affect only the epidermis of our great Mother, not her features. 'The Bedouin', says Moltke, 'waters his horses and camels at the same sources and pastures his herds on the same green stretches as did Abraham and Mohammed.' 'The Akropolis of Athens', adds KROMAYER, 'presents to us the same rocky surface that it did to Perikles, and the walls of Mykenai look down on the same unclimbable scaur.' Nature has wrought her will, it is true, but undisturbed by man. There is some comfort to be derived from two thousand years of neglect.

Greece, then, seems to be especially favored for researches of this kind and the period that KROMAYER and his associates have selected especially important. It is a 'congenial' period. 'The inner and outer conditions of the life of the modern state are more like those of the last period of Greek history than those of all that go before'. This gives an American citizen of the old school the shivers, however it may delight the student of the military art, which, it seems, does not become a real science until there is no freedom to fight for.—Chaironeia has been a name of evil omen to republican life for all these centuries, and Milton has branded it forever with the name of 'dishonest victory'. But that does not keep the work of KROMAYER and his associates from being honest work and the book is full of enlightenment. Very interesting is what is said of Diodoros, the butt of so many critics, very interesting the effort to extract a nucleus of fact from the floscules of Ephoros, the great source of Diodoros.

The 'so-called' iterative optative is a favorite theme of discussion. Somebody has recently written a tract of 50 pages on the iterative optative in Thukydides, and in the last volume of the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (XXXIII 101), there is a rehandling of the well-worn subject by Dr. JAMES TURNER ALLEN. That there is no notion of iteration in the optative itself, that the notion arises from the combination with an imperfect tense or iterative past tense, and that we might as well speak of an iterative subjunctive in combination with a universal present, that we might as well speak of an iterative perfect indicative, an iterative pluperfect indicative in Latin, is, or ought to be, sufficiently clear by this time (L. G. § 567). Iterative optative is a dangerous expression, I grant, and optative in iterative

sentences would be safer, but there is danger in the use of many of the convenient phrases that we employ in the school-room. When we say that $\delta\tau\alpha\nu$ with subjunctive 'becomes' $\delta\tau\epsilon$ with optative after a past tense, we are simply dealing with descriptive, not with genetic syntax. The $\delta\nu$ of oratio obliqua is never lost. It is the original $\delta\tau\epsilon$ with the subjunctive that 'becomes' $\delta\tau\epsilon$ with the optative, as I set forth many years ago (A. J. P. III 442); and 'becomes' itself is a so-called 'becomes'. So of the process called 'repraesentatio'. We say that the original subjunctive construction is retained after $\iota\nu\alpha$, $\delta\tau\alpha\nu$ and the like, after a past tense by 'repraesentatio'. And then some one points out triumphantly that the iterative optative is always retained. Yes. But why? On the simple principle that you cannot eat your cake and have it too. And this profound maxim I impressed on my beginners in Greek wellnigh fifty years ago. You cannot have *repraesentatio* and a distinct reference to the past in the same breath. As to the origin of the 'Modusverschiebung' I have nothing more to say here (A. J. P. XXIII 129). That the iterative or frequentative optative did not originate in the conditional sentence, if we may judge by Homer (Monro, H. G. § 311) is an old story, but old, old stories have a fascination for the grammatical soul and I find myself too often guilty of the same vain repetition that I find fault with in others.

When the apostle says: 'I am a debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, both to the wise and the unwise', he is not rhetorical, he is effusively natural. The combination of opposites or complements to form a totality is common to all languages, if one dare generalize in such matters. So we of English speech inherit a host of such expressions as 'man and woman' = 'mankind', 'up and down' = 'everywhere', 'small and great' = 'everybody', 'rich and poor' = 'society'. We make a goodly number to suit emergencies and, as is the shameless way of our piratical speech, we help ourselves to foreign prefixes, if need be, such as 'anti-' and 'non-', 'revolutionist', and 'anti-revolutionist', 'union' and 'non-union', 'Catholic' and 'non-Catholic'. The psychological process of this polarization, as it has been called, is not uninteresting, and the manifestation of it in different languages is not un instructive. Why are the poles of the same contrast reversed, say in English and in German as 'soul and body' 'Leib und Seele'? Why are polarizations familiar in one language and not familiar in another? Why do the Germans say 'Er kennt Gott und die Welt' whereas we have nothing exactly equivalent? Then there is the emergence of contrasts such as $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega$ and $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omega$, the fixing of synonyms by 'antonyms', as they have been called. There is the use of the pair when only one is strictly appropriate, as in the passionate words of Kreon, Antig. 1108-09: $\tau\tau'$, $\tau\tau'$ $\delta\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, $\omicron\iota$ τ' $\delta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\omicron\iota$ τ' $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. In this light it is not so absurd after all to say, 'Now

parents that have children dear and eke ye that have none'. These are all points that have always attracted the student of semantics, and it is not surprising that with the increasing interest in the psychological side of syntactical studies, the last few years should have brought us two treatises on the subject: one by Henrich, *Die sog. polarische Ausdrucksweise im Griechischen*, 1899; the other by Dr. ERNST KEMMER (Würzburg, Stuber, 1903). The former has not reached the Journal; the latter is No. 15 of SCHANZ'S *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. The author labors or seems to labor heavily in the elaborate psychological part. In what is for me the practical part, the material will be welcome to the student of Greek, but Dr. KEMMER lacks the lightness of touch that is so desirable in handling the mass of facts. One thinks what a master like BRÉAL would have made of the subject, and sighs.

H. L. W.: Students of Latin epigraphy have long needed a collection of the most important and interesting inscriptions in two or three handy volumes which one could carry on a journey or use during a summer vacation as a substitute for the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. The first volume of such a collection was issued eleven years ago by H. Dessau (*Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, I, Berlin, 1892) and contains 2956 inscriptions classified in ten chapters each of which—with one or two exceptions—is concerned with a special class of individuals. The first part of the second volume (Berlin, 1902, pp. 736) now brings the total number of inscriptions to 7210, adding four chapters, *Tituli sacri et sacerdotum* (XI), *Tituli pertinentes ad ludos* (XII), *Tituli operum locorumque publicorum. Termini. Tituli nonnulli aedificiorum privatorum* (XIII), *Tituli municipales* (XIV). Scattered through these chapters are many inscriptions not yet published in the *Corpus*, notably the archaic inscription of the Roman Forum discovered in 1899 (No. 4913). As in the first volume, the text is accompanied by a brief but scholarly and helpful commentary. It is sincerely to be hoped that the remainder of the second volume as well as the third, which is to contain the indices, will appear long before another decade has elapsed.